

## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE		FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/936,203		11/08/2001	Norbert Becker	1454.1090	2419	
21171	7590	02/07/2006		EXAMINER		
STAAS &	HALSEY	LLP	BENGZON	BENGZON, GREG C		
SUITE 700 1201 NEW	YORK AV	VENUE, N.W.	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER		
WASHING			2144			

DATE MAILED: 02/07/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
09/936,203	BECKER ET AL.		
Examiner	Art Unit		

					<u></u>
The MAILING DATE of this commu	nication appe	ars on the cover s	heet with the	correspondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED 22 December 2005 FAILS T	O PLACE THIS	S APPLICATION IN	CONDITION I	FOR ALLOWANCE.	
<ol> <li>The reply was filed after a final rejection, be this application, applicant must timely file of places the application in condition for allow (3) a Request for Continued Examination ( following time periods:</li> </ol>	one of the follo vance; (2) a No	wing replies: (1) an otice of Appeal (with	amendment, a n appeal fee) in	iffidavit, or other evide compliance with 37 (	ence, which CFR 41.31: or
a) The period for reply expiresmonths f	rom the mailing d	ate of the final rejection	١.		
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing event, however, will the statutory period for rep Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check eith MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See	date of this Advi oly expire later thaner box (a) or (b).	sory Action, or (2) the on SIX MONTHS from ONLY CHECK BOX (	date set forth in th the mailing date o	f the final rejection.	
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(been filed is the date for purposes of determining the peri CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later the earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	(a). The date on a code of extension as the shortened sta	which the petition unde nd the corresponding a tutory period for reply o	mount of the fee.	The appropriate extension final Office action: or (2)	n fee under 37 as set forth in (b)
The Notice of Appeal was filed on     of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.3' Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, an AMENDMENTS	7(a)), or any ex	tension thereof (37	CFR 41.37(e)	), to avoid dismissal o	of the appeal.
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a (a) They raise new issues that would req (b) They raise the issue of new matter (s	uire further cor	nsideration and/or s	e of filing a brie search (see NO	f, will <u>not</u> be entered t TE below);	pecause
(c) They are not deemed to place the appapeal; and/or	plication in bet	ter form for appeal			the issues for
(d) They present additional claims without NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116	and 41.33(a)).				
<ul> <li>4.  The amendments are not in compliance winders.</li> <li>5.  Applicant's reply has overcome the following.</li> </ul>	ith 37 CFR 1.1: ina rejection(s)	21. See attached N :	otice of Non-Co	ompliant Amendment	(PTOL-324).
Newly proposed or amended claim(s) the non-allowable claim(s).			d in a separate	, timely filed amendm	ent canceling
7.  For purposes of appeal, the proposed ame how the new or amended claims would be The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as Claim(s) allowed: <u>none</u> . Claim(s) objected to: <u>none</u> .	rejected is prov	☐ will not be enter	red, or b) 🛛 wended.	ill be entered and an o	explanation of
Claim(s) objected to: <u>none</u> .  Claim(s) rejected: <u>12,13,15,17 and 19</u> .  Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:					
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE					
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after a because applicant failed to provide a showi and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFF</li> </ol>	ing of good and R 1.116(e).	d sufficient reasons	why the affida	vit or other evidence is	s necessary
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after th entered because the affidavit or other evide showing a good and sufficient reasons why</li> </ol>	ence failed to o tit is necessary	vercome <u>all</u> rejectio , and was not earlie	ns under appea er presented. S	al and/or appellant fai see 37 CFR 41.33(d)(	Is to provide a 1).
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	An explanation	n of the status of th	e claims after e	entry is below or attac	hed.
11.   The request for reconsideration has been See Continuation Sheet.	considered but	does NOT place th	ne application i	n condition for allowa	nce because:
<ul><li>12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure</li><li>13. ☐ Other:</li></ul>	Statement(s).	(PTO/SB/08 or PTC	D-1449) Paper I	No(s)	
			/	4	
				DAVIDWILEY	
S. Patent and Trademark Office				SORY PATENT EXAM	
> Parent and Trademark (1thick				HOLDON DENITED 210	1/1

PTOL-303 (Rev. 7-05)

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100
Part of Paper No. 20060129

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The scope of the Claims have not been altered sufficiently to overcome the prior art of record .

## Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 12/22/2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

The Applicant asserts that since the title, sections and subsections mentioned by Ferrel are assigned GIUDs, then the limitation regarding 'identifiers of the objects... that are allowed to non-unique relative to other objects within different environment' is not disclosed by Ferrel.

The Examiner respectfully disagrees with the Applicant. Ferrel disclosed that objects can be shared across content providers or publishers (Column 7 Lines 25-30), and that objects may be linked with many titles (Column 22 Lines 10-15). The concepts of re-usable programming objects are well known in the art of object-oriented programming, such that objects are only created once (and named only once) and re-used across several documents. While each object may be assigned a GUID, the object instance is derived from the hierarchical structure (Container, title, section, subsection) that the object is linked to. Thus, the context of environment is described using the combination of the GUIDs assigned to the higher level objects that compose said hierarchical structure. Given an object that is linked to two container object stores, the object instance(s) (as identified by the said context environment) will be different and independent for each object instance.